

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 4, 9, 12, and 14 are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4-5, 9-10, and 12-14 are currently pending and under consideration.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4-5, 9-10, AND 12-14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER BAKER (US 5,363,475)

Baker teaches a computer image generator suitable for generating information in real time from which an image can be derived for display.

The Examiner states, "Baker does not explicitly teach 'wherein the image of said subsequent object is rendered between said start and [said] end of rendering said one object' but that *"Baker's parallel process of object data through the parallel processors 82-87 and post-sorters 1-200 rending the linked objects in parallel causes the subsequent object being rendered between the start and the end of the said one object"* (see bottom of page 2 through top of page 3 of the Office Action, emphasis added). The Examiner believes such claimed feature would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art "[g]iven a series of substantial [] parallel processings as Baker's processors and post-sorters."

However, Baker fails to teach the features as recited in claim 4 of the present invention. For example, in column 35, lines 24-35, Baker teaches,

These subsystems may comprise an array of processors 82 to 87 each allocated a particular task. The detailed relationship between the various subsystems and the inputs to the color mixer is not germane to the present invention. It is simply necessary to appreciate that the color mixer provides an output 88 which includes an RGBT value for each pseudopixel of the pseudocell being processed. The output 88 is delivered to the postsorter 52.

Nothing in the above-described disclosure of Baker teaches, either implicitly or explicitly, the claimed feature "wherein the image of said subsequent object is rendered between a start and an end of rendering said one object." In fact, the Examiner appears to rely on broad conclusory statements, subjective belief, and unknown authority in suggesting that the claimed

feature would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art "[g]iven a series of substantial [] parallel processings as Baker's processors and post-sorters."

Independent claims 4, 9, 12, and 14 of the present invention are amended herein to define that the entire image of the subsequent object is rendered between a start and an end of rendering the one object, so that the rendering of the entire image of said subsequent object is initiated and also completed while the rendering of the one object is discontinued. In other words, in the present invention, the rendering of one, higher layered object which is linked to a subsequent or lower layered linked object is discontinued while the entirety of the lower layered linked object is rendered after the start of rendering the higher layered object. The discontinued rendering of the one higher layered object is resumed after the rendering of the entirety of the lower layered linked object finishes. This feature of the presented invention is not disclosed in Baker.

Support for the above-described features of the present invention may be found in paragraphs 0055 and 0066 and FIGS. 4 and 5 in the Applicants' specification. As described in paragraph 0066, "the subroutine at S512 is nested", i.e., Steps S502-S514 are performed recursively. This feature of the invention reflects the recursive operations of the subroutine of rendering an object in the embodiment (FIG.5) of the present invention, which is not disclosed in the Baker.

According to the above, it is submitted that independent claims 4, 9, 12, and 14 patentably distinguish over the disclosure of Baker. Claims 5, 10, and 13 depend from independent claims 4, 9, and 12, respectively, and patentably distinguish over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as claims 4, 9, and 12.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6-22-06

By: Derrick L. Fields
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501